CITY OF ISSAQUAH
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

NOTICE OF DECISION

TO: Gary Costa, Transportation Manager
City of Issaquah Public Works Engineering Department
P.O. Box 1307
Issaquah, WA. 98027

SUBJECT: **NW Dogwood Street Bridge Replacement**

APPLICATION: SHO14-00009

DATE OF DECISION: November 13, 2014

REQUEST:

Shoreline Substantial Development permit to replace the existing NW Dogwood St Bridge over Issaquah Creek.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The City of Issaquah proposes to replace the existing NW Dogwood Street bridge over Issaquah Creek. The existing bridge is narrow and allows for only one vehicle to pass, and has been designated structurally deficient for truck load bearing limits. The new bridge includes 2 traffic lanes, sidewalks, and a lane for parking or a future bicycle lane. The new bridge would increase flood conveyance capacity by increasing the bridge length and elevating the bridge profile over Issaquah Creek by 5 feet higher than the existing bridge. No new structures would be installed below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of Issaquah Creek, existing concrete piles below the OHWM would be removed. Utilities would be relocated and attached underneath the new bridge. The project would result in approximately 4,200 square feet of new impervious surface. Mitigation for project impacts would enhance 7,966 square feet of riparian habitat along Issaquah Creek.

LOCATION: NW Dogwood St; east of Newport Way NW and west of Rainier Blvd N and Front St N.

DECISION MADE: Approval of this application is based on application materials and supporting technical studies listed as Exhibits 6-10 at the back of this report.

On November 13, 2014, the Development Services Department conditionally approved the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for the above proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The City shall obtain all State and Federal permits and authorizations prior to beginning any clearing or ground disturbance activities.

2. No trees are to be damaged or removed except those trees shown to be removed on the plans. Approved tree protection measures shall be in place prior to any construction or demolition activities. The tree protection may be installed with the clearing and grading limits or TESC measures.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

1. Permit Review Process: A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is required because the proposed bridge replacement is located within the shoreline jurisdiction of Issaquah Creek. A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is required for the bridge replacement because the larger bridge footprint doesn't qualify for a Shoreline Exemption as normal maintenance/repair or replacement under WAC 173-27-040(2)(b).

A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is a Level 2 review per IMC Table 18.04.100-1. A Level 2 review is an administrative permit decision and requires notice to adjacent property owners within 300 feet of the proposal (Exhibit 3). A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit also requires legal notice in the local newspaper and a Shoreline Public Meeting (IMC18.04.180.B4). See Exhibit 4.

A Shoreline Public Meeting was held on May 21, 2013 before the City's River & Streams Board. The River & Streams Board also had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal. A copy of the meeting minutes is included as Exhibit 5.

2. SEPA Environmental Review: A SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was issued on October 8, 2014. The project proposal incorporates mitigation to address project impacts and therefore no additional SEPA mitigation measures were required. The SEPA Determination is included as Exhibit 11.

3. Shoreline Master Program (SMP) – Shoreline Substantial Development Permit:

The NW Dogwood St bridge is located in the *Issaquah Creek Shoreline Residential* Shoreline Environment designation.

Bridges are included under the definition of "Road" in the SMP: *"Road. Road means a linear passageway, usually for motor vehicles. Bridges are roads which cross over water."* Therefore, bridges would be considered as a transportation use, which is allowed as a permitted use in the *Issaquah Creek Shoreline Residential* Shoreline Environment designation, according to Table 1, Permitted Shoreline Uses.

Transportation facilities require a 100-foot buffer from Issaquah Creek, Table 2, Development Standards for Shoreline Environments. This standard is intended for new roads and is not feasible to apply to bridges. For utilities there is a specific footnote in the table that buffers/setbacks do not apply to water-dependent utilities. A bridge is also water-dependent and cannot meet stream buffers/setbacks.

The proposed new bridge would increase the bridge size/footprint in order to increase the width of traffic lanes so cars can safely pass on the bridge, to add sidewalks for pedestrian safety, and to add a parking lane or future bicycle lane. The existing bridge, 26 feet wide by 70 feet long, would be replaced with a new 48-foot wide by 95-foot long bridge. Retaining walls have been incorporated into the design to minimize the footprint of the new bridge. The new bridge would result in 1,345 SF of additional shade over Issaquah Creek and impact 4,113 SF of stream buffer. To mitigate for these impacts, the City would enhance the 7,966 SF of stream buffer on a parcel located directly to the northeast of the bridge.

The Shoreline Master Program (SMP) includes policies (5.17.1) and regulations (5.17.2) that apply to Transportation Facilities in all the Shoreline Environment Designations. The proposed new, replacement bridge meets the policies and regulations as follows:

Transportation Facilities

5.17.1 Policies

1. *Transportation facilities, including new facilities and repair and improvement of existing facilities should be located, designed, constructed and maintained to have minimum impacts on shoreline resources.*

Finding: The replacement and improvement of an existing bridge precludes the construction of a new bridge in another location, which minimizes overall impacts on shoreline resources. The bridge has been designed to minimize impacts; bridge abutments would be constructed outside the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of the stream channel, and the design incorporates the use of retaining walls to minimize encroachment impacts into the stream buffer.

2. *New roads should be allowed only when related to and necessary for the support of permitted shoreline activities.*

Finding: The proposal is to replace an existing bridge/road crossing and is not related to other shoreline development activity.

3. *New transportation facilities should be located and designed to minimize the need for shoreline protection measures, modifications to natural drainage systems, and crossing waterways.*

Finding: The replacement bridge has been designed to minimize the use of riprap and bank stabilization to protect the pier structures. It is not expected that additional shoreline protection measures will be needed to protect the new bridge. The new bridge reduces existing streambank riprap and would remove existing concrete piles in the stream channel, an improvement over the existing conditions.

4. *Shoreline restoration and public access should be considered with planning and funding of transportation projects.*

Finding: The existing bridge has no sidewalks. The new bridge would add sidewalks on both sides of the road, improving pedestrian and public access over the existing conditions.

5. *Expansion or major improvements to existing roads within shoreline jurisdiction should improve water quality by providing stormwater treatment of existing, untreated road runoff to an extent proportional to the proposed road improvement.*

Finding: All runoff from the new bridge would be directed to catch basins and to new outfalls under the bridge. The bridge replacement is exempt from providing water quality treatment per the City's Stormwater Code. The City evaluated the option of adding water quality treatment, but it was considered infeasible given the existing stormwater system and crowning of the new bridge road section.

6. *New stream crossings should be minimized to the extent feasible and mitigate for their impacts. New culverts or bridges should be designed to allow fish passage, movement of organic material, and to accommodate a 100-year flood event. All Stream crossings*

should fully mitigate for their impacts.

Finding: The proposal would replace an existing bridge, avoiding a new stream crossing. The new bridge would increase flood conveyance capacity by increasing the bridge length and elevating the bridge profile over Issaquah Creek. The existing bridge has a 500 SF opening under it. By elevating the bridge and excavating approximately 400 cubic yards of existing riprap, sand and gravel under the east bridge abutment, the new opening under the bridge would be 900 SF, significantly increasing its capacity to pass flood flows and large woody debris (LWD). Removal of existing concrete piles in the stream channel and enhancement of the stream buffer would improve fish habitat and passage.

7. *Bikeways and trails for non-motorized use should be provided along roads in shoreline jurisdiction to the extent feasible, and should be considered when rights-of-way are being vacated or abandoned.*

Finding: The new bridge would add sidewalks on both sides to improve pedestrian/non-motorized use. A lane will be added to the bridge, which could be used in the future for a bicycle trail.

5.17.2 Regulations

1. *Transportation regulations shall apply to any use or development where transportation infrastructure is or is proposed to be a primary land use, including new or expanded roadways and parking facilities.*

Finding: The SMP transportation regulations apply to the proposed replacement bridge. The proposed bridge replacement complies with the transportation regulations in the Shoreline Master Program.

3. *Transportation uses and development shall be carried out in a manner that maintains or improves State water quality standards for receiving waters through implementation of state and City stormwater regulations.*

Finding: All runoff from the new bridge would be directed to catch basins and directed to new outfalls under the bridge. The bridge replacement is exempt from providing water quality treatment per the City's Stormwater Code. The City evaluated the option of adding water quality treatment, but it was considered infeasible given the existing stormwater system and crowning of the new bridge road section.

4. *New transportation facilities and improvements to existing transportation facilities, not including public trails, shall be located outside of the shoreline buffer, unless there is no feasible alternative. Any required impacts within the shoreline buffer shall meet standards of mitigation, as specified by this Program.*

Finding: The proposal is to replace an existing bridge. Bridges are a water-dependent use which crosses a stream and cannot be located outside the shoreline buffer, there is no feasible alternative. The new bridge would result in 1,345 SF of additional shade over Issaquah Creek and impact 4,113 SF of stream buffer. To mitigate for these impacts, the City would enhance the 7,966 SF of stream buffer on a parcel located directly to the northeast of the bridge. The proposed mitigation exceeds a 1:1 ratio of impacted area to mitigation area.

5. *Bridges are the preferred method for crossing streams and shall be designed to span the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM). New roads shall be located to minimize the need for routing surface waters into and through culverts.*

Finding: The new bridge would span the OHWM, all bridge abutments and piles are landward of the OHWM. The proposal would remove 8 existing concrete piles from the stream channel, reducing potential scour energy from being transported downstream.

6. *New transportation facilities shall be located and designed to preclude the need for shoreline stabilization and structural flood protection.*

Finding: The proposal is to replace an existing bridge/street crossing, so the location of the bridge is fixed. The replacement bridge has been designed to minimize the use of riprap and bank stabilization to protect the pier structures. It is not expected that additional shoreline protection measures will be needed to protect the new bridge.

7. *Vehicle and pedestrian circulation systems shall be designed to minimize clearing, grading and alteration of topography and natural features. Roadway and driveway alignment shall follow the natural contours and minimize width to the maximum extent feasible.*

Finding: The new bridge has been designed to minimize clearing/grading and alteration of topography. The width of the new bridge has been expanded over the existing bridge width to allow for passage of 2-way vehicle travel and to provide sidewalks to improve pedestrian safety and public access. The bridge length is increased to raise the bridge elevation to increase the flood conveyance capacity.

Other SMP policies and regulations apply to aspects or elements of the proposed road improvements, including; critical areas, vegetation conservation, water quality, public access, archeological and cultural resources, etc. The proposed bridge replacement complies with the policies and standards of the SMP.

An appeal of this Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (Level 2) must be filed with the Development Services Department Permit Center within 14 days of this notice of decision, by 5:00 PM on November 28, 2014.

Peter Rosen

Peter Rosen, Senior Environmental Planner

11/13/2014
Date

EXHIBIT LIST:

1. File and Application, SHO14-00009
2. 95% Construction Plans dated April 2014
3. Notice of Application and Shoreline Public Meeting
4. Legal Newspaper Notice for Shoreline Permit and Shoreline Public Meeting

5. Shoreline Public Meeting Minutes
6. Environmental Checklist, dated June 3, 2014
7. Critical Areas Report (David Evans and Assoc.), dated March 4, 2014
8. Biological Evaluation (David Evans and Assoc.), dated January 9, 2014
9. Geotechnical Preliminary Foundation Recommendations (Zipper Zeman Assoc.), dated September 18, 2006
10. Cultural Resource Determination of Effect letter (Trent de Boer, WSDOT Archaeologist) dated March 13, 2014
11. SEPA Determination